

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. III.

SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1834.

NO. 24.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK
AND PHILADELPHIA.

EDITED BY
T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. PRICE, PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—Two Dollars per ann. in advance, or \$2.50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (foot of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia.
Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

[Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1834, by P. PRICE, in the Clerks Office of the Southern District of New-York.]

ANSWERS

TO

"213 Questions without Answers,"

By D. De Vinne,

WITH REJOINDERS,

By A. C. Thomas.

29. If the requirements of the mercy, are opposed to the demands of the justice of God, can his kingdom stand? Mark iii, 24.
30. If the justice and mercy of God are in any way opposed, do they "keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace?"
31. If justice and mercy are opposed in their requirements, can Deity be a "just God and a Savior?" Isa. xlv, 21.

A. But Mercy and justice are not opposed in their claims, as already shown in Answer 28.

Rej. Agreed. See Rejoinder on Q. 22, 23, 24, 26, 28.

32. If "a God all mercy is a God unjust," would not a God all justice be a God unmerciful?
33. Is there any such thing in God as unjust mercy, or unmerciful justice?
34. Is there any such thing in God as just cruelty, or merciful injustice?

A. The suppositions in these Questions have no existence in the nature of God, and to reason upon them would be an attempt to build without a foundation. God might however be just, without being merciful; see on Question 23, but in his administration he exercises justice with abundant mercy.

Rej. It is impossible that Deity can be just without being at the same time merciful. If God might be just without being merciful, he might be unmercifully [that is, cruelly] just! The force of the Questions cannot be evaded, either by quibbling or sophistry.

35. If you had sufficient power, would you not deliver all men from sin?

A. This would depend altogether upon my knowledge of the consequences of the exertion of that power. The putting forth of power without sufficient knowledge to direct it, might be awfully injurious. Nothing, however is more absurd than the attempt to draw a parallel between our Maker and ourselves. God is a moral governor, who maintains law and order for the good of worlds and millions, seeing at once the bearing and relation of things throughout immensity and to infinite duration. Man, on the contrary is a sinner, interested on his own behalf, a mere unit, an atom, pent up in a disordered body, having only five senses or windows to look out of, and comparatively knowing nothing. Ask the criminal, in the States Prison, "if he had sufficient power, what would he do? Would he not demolish the walls, annul the law, and let every man enjoy his li-

berty? But let the governor and good people of the state, say whether this would be for the general good. But even put this question to a good man, conscious of his ignorance and insufficiency, and he would say, No, he would not interfere with that of which he knew nothing; but would fully confide in the Judge of all the earth, who will do right.

Rej. What could be consequential on the delivery of all men from sin, other than the final holiness and happiness of all mankind? Is this an objectionable consummation? Would this be an "awfully injurious" result? The respondent allows that God desires the salvation of all men. Is it reasonable to suppose that he can desire an "awfully injurious" issue of his own administration? Why is it said, "It pleased the Father to reconcile ALL THINGS to himself," if so be that universal reconciliation would be a lamentable result of his divine economy? I grant you that prisons are requisite in the present state of society, and it would be an evil to destroy them. But if "the Governor and good people of the state" could bring every individual into conformity with the law, would prisons be either useful or desirable? And would any good citizen deem this an "awfully injurious" state of things? Is there any one who would hesitate to employ the requisite power, if he possessed it, to render prisons and punishments uncalled for? Now the pen of inspiration has declared that "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Could any thing be more desirable? And would any Christian, whose heart is filled with the love of Christ, hesitate to yield his assent to such a glorious consummation of the reign of the Lord?

36. Are you more merciful than the God who made you?

37. "Can a woman forget her sucking child?"

38. Is the Creator of human sympathy less benevolent than the creature?

A. To all these we answer, No. See on Question 2d, 28, 35, and others, in which the spirit of these are answered.

Rej. The reader is referred to the Rejoinders to the Answers referred to by the respondent.

39. If God would save all men, but cannot, is He infinite in power?

A. To this we answer, 1. God is infinite in power. 2. He is willing to save all men. But 3. He cannot deny Himself; that is, he cannot act contrary to His own perfections: one perfection cannot act to the destruction of another. God has power to create ten thousand worlds, where there is none; to make men fifty feet high; fill rivers with oil, and raise mountains of Gold; but His wisdom does not see proper to do it. So the wisdom, power, and other attributes of God, made man what he is, a free moral agent, he is still governed as such, and if he be ever saved, he must be saved as such. Now we say that such a being cannot be saved by physical or irresistible force; God may annihilate his agency, and then he is altogether another kind of being, but while he remains what he is, a free moral Agent, we say, and we say it with reverence, that God cannot irresistibly save him. Motives, and only motives, can govern such a being in his moral character, and all these which God set before him, he may resist. The whole of this question, resolves itself into this: Can Omnipotence do an impossibility, can God lie, or deny himself?

Rej. I never supposed that God, in reconciling all things to himself, would do the least violence to the human will, or in the least degree infringe the moral agency of man.

40. If God can save all men, but will not, is He infinite in goodness?

A. But to answer this question, supposing

God were to annihilate man's free agency, in order to save him; how would he be saved? Not as an intelligent free creature: in that case, he would be *unmade, degraded*, and sunk to the level of a brute, wholly incapable of that noble and intellectual enjoyment, of which he was capable in his state of moral freedom, would this deprivation be an act of infinite goodness? It would be an act of goodness like the man, who should pull out the eyes, or cut off the hands of his son, for fear he should learn to write, commit forgery and go to the States Prison. If God's goodness is only to be known by His irresistible destruction of misery, why does he not do it in this world? Surely the world is full of it, and has been teeming with it during five thousand years. Matter of fact, tells us that God does not irresistibly destroy sin and misery in this world, and we have no more reason to believe that He will do it in the other, than in this. In this world, and in the present state of things, we discover the principle of the divine government, and that tells us plainly that God will not irresistibly, in opposition to man's free agency, destroy sin and misery. Do not trust to such a supposition.

Rej. See the Rejoinder to the preceding Answer. As to the reason why "God does not irresistibly destroy sin and misery in this world," I remark, that I do not feel disposed to sit in judgment on the doings of the Almighty.—The Bible says, "The creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, because the creature itself also SHALL BE DELIVERED from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Rom. viii, 20, 21.

"Here rest, my soul; no farther seek to go;
What God reveals is sure enough to know."

41. Does God desire the salvation of all men?

A. Yes, he desires that all may be saved as intelligent, free moral agents, but not as stocks and stone.

42. As God is righteous, must not a desire for universal salvation be a righteous desire?

A. Yes.

43. Is it true, that "the desire of the righteous shall be granted?" Prov. x, 24.

A. Yes, for the righteous never desire any thing which is contrary to the will and order of God. When God desires man to be saved, as an intelligent creature, the righteous do not desire him to be saved as a brute.

Rej. If we put the three foregoing Answers together, we find the doctrine of Universalism clearly proved. God, whose desires are all righteous, desires that all men may be saved as intelligent, moral agents; the desire of the righteous shall be granted; therefore, all men shall be saved as intelligent moral agents. I do not desire that they should be saved in any other way—nor do I believe they ever will be.

44. Did God design universal salvation when He created man?

A. Yes, on the condition of faith and obedience, but not by any fixed unconditional purpose.

Rej. Surely the Almighty never designs an end without determining, definitely, to adopt all the means necessary to the accomplishment thereof. The New Testament speaks of a certain man who began to build and was not able to finish. That man either lacked wisdom when he formed the design, or was not able to overcome the difficulties attending the enterprise—neither of which suppositions can be applied to the Supreme Being. "O Lord, how manifold are thy works; in wisdom hast thou made them all." Ps. civ, 24. "His work is perfect." Deut. xxxii, 4.

45. Will God carry his original design into execution?

A. Yes. Design signifies something marked out, studied, arranged; in application to the present subject, it means that plan of faith and obedience which God has marked out or devised, as the wisest and best to save free intelligent creatures; thus, when man sinned, and was unable to keep the first covenant of works, God gave His Son a Mediator, and made the new and better covenant of Faith. By this, millions will be saved. Let us attend to the following considerations.

1. It is estimated that nearly one half of all who are born, die under ten years of age, or before they come to a state of accountability. These, our Savior says, are "of the kingdom of heaven," and consequently saved through His merits.

2. The probable number of "The sons of God," Gen. vi, 2, or, *regenerate persons* who lived before the true religion was corrupted, near or, about the age of the flood.

3. Those who were really born from above, the spiritual members of Christ, whether in the former Jewish Church, or among the various denominations of Christians in the latter.

4. Those among the heathens, "In all nations who fear God, and work righteousness."

5. There is an age coming, according to prophecy, in which "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." Isa. xi, 9. In which pure religion, will gain the entire ascendancy, in numbers and influence, and probably reign for a long time, so that the number of saved may far transcend that of the lost.

Rej. Allowing that "the number of the saved may far transcend that of the lost," still the original design of God will not be carried into execution, if so be that a single soul is lost—for he designs universal salvation.

Original.

THE METHODIST PAPER.

The reader probably recollects the article headed "Universalist Controversy," copied into the 22d number of the Messenger and Universalist, from the Advocate and Journal. After reading that article in the paper in which it originated, I addressed the following note to the editors.

"For the Christian Advocate and Journal.

Messrs. Editors—By your last paper, I perceive you decline publishing both sides of the controversy, pending between Messrs. Morse and Lee. The Universalists very much regret that you have come to this conclusion, as your paper has an extensive circulation, and as it is extremely difficult, if not absolutely impossible, to understand the merits of the case, without seeing both sides of the question.

Now, gentlemen, my design in addressing you, is, to inform such of your readers who may be desirous of obtaining the whole controversy, that it is published in full by Rev. Dolphus Skinner, in the columns of the "Evangelical Magazine and Gospel Advocate," Utica, N. Y.

Your insertion of the above, will confer a favor on your obedient servant, S. J. HILLYER.
Brooklyn, March 25, 1834."

Reader, do you discover any thing in the above to justify those to whom it was addressed in withholding it from their readers? Yet instead of allowing this note to speak for itself, to-day's Advocate and Journal, contains the following:

"A Universalist, as we take him to be, complains that, in the Christian Advocate and Journal of the 21st ult. 'we decline,' as he expresses it, 'publishing both sides of the controversy pending between Messrs. Morse and Lee.' This is hardly correct. The article we declined publishing, (Mr. Morse's letter) should have been sent us last October; and for ought we can see, might as easily have been sent us then, as now. If the Universalists 'regret' this, still they cannot blame us. We have said, and still say, that with the increasing demand upon our columns, we cannot go back so far to bring up the con-

troversy. If it had been sent us in season, we should have published it.

The writer farther says, his 'design in addressing us now is, to inform such of our readers as may be desirous of obtaining the whole controversy' where it may be found. But, if he will look at our note of the 21st inst. he will see that we have already done this."

For a reply to the first paragraph of the above, I refer the reader to an editorial article in the 22d number of the present volume of this paper.

Believing as I did, that the great majority of the readers of the Advocate and Journal, were unacquainted with the fact that the Universalist paper ingenuously publishes both sides of the controversy, and supposing that there might be some among so many, who might wish to examine the whole discussion, and yet not know where to send for the paper containing it, I attempted to inform them. But it appears that my design has been defeated. The Methodist editors suppose that they have already informed their readers of that which I designed to communicate; and refer to their note of the 21st ult. This note I have already adverted to, and would now ask the reader to turn to it again, and see if he can find the substance contained in the expression of my design. It is true, they say, speaking of Br. Morse's letter, that it "contains nearly ten columns of the Evangelical Magazine and Gospel Advocate." But is there any thing said about this paper publishing the whole controversy? Or is the reader informed where he can send for it? No. If the reader will reflect upon this part of the subject it will render it unnecessary for me to say more. However, I will offer it as my opinion, and I hope it will not manifest a want of charity, that that mind deserves to be pitied for its weakness, or that heart censured for its destitution of candor, which, in the face of all the facts relating to the controversy between Messrs. Morse and Lee, will not openly acknowledge that there is a studied design on the part of the managers of the Methodist Advocate and Journal to give to the public a one sided view of the arguments in regard to this debate.

S. J. H.
Brooklyn, April 4, 1834.

CORRESPONDENCE.

We last week made an extract from a private communication from Br. K. Townsend. We now venture another which we presume will be interesting to the reader, in showing the progress of our cause in the far-off west.

"I became an Universalist by reading the word of God, and at the time was a farmer.—Soon after, I commenced preaching in the vicinity of my residence, (Lewistown,) and continued more than a year, before I asked the fellowship of the order. About 18 months since I moved to Gaines, and have ministered since that time to the societies in Gaines, Knowlesville or Barry, Holly, and North Murray. In the latter place a society has been built up during my labors with them, which consists of about 40 members, and in wealth and respectability, and understanding zeal, it is all that heart could wish. After having held protracted meetings of every variety of kind and length, I believe our orthodox brethren, universally, are satisfied that it has been to them a most disastrous business. Our cause has been generally prosperous, within my circuit, and our congregations almost always good.

"During the time I have been preaching, I have visited the state of Ohio twice, Michigan once, and Canada three times. In my visit to Ohio and Michigan, our worthy and talented Br. Tomlinson was my fellow laborer and companion. Since our return an invitation has been received for him or myself to locate with them, with the assurance of a compensation graduated to our demands. It is probable that neither of us can go, although it is not because we do not

fully estimate their wants. My family and other matters for the present will probably tie me to New-York. Br. Sweet, his christian name I do not recollect, is located at Parkman, and has formed a church there. He was formerly of Marietta and Belpre. Br. Nathan Wadsworth is located in Olmsted, where there is a church built and a society established. We visited and preached in Pontiac, Northville, Plymouth, Ann Arbor, Adrian, Tecumseh, Clinton, Lodi, and Ypsilanta. In all these places, except Pontiac and Ypsilanta, our cause is flourishing. Br. Curtis is now laboring with our brethren in Adrian and its vicinity.

I yesterday received a letter from Ann Arbor saying they had formed a society of 40 to 50 members. That the foundation of a house 30 by 40 was laid, \$750 raised toward the building. I cannot but believe that our journey there (truly a very laborious one) will eventuate in a lasting benefit to the cause. I believe four preachers would find a handsome support in Michigan. I confess I feel a peculiar interest in our cause in that section."

STANWICH DISCUSSION.

Just after our last paper had gone to press, Br. Hillyer put into our hands the following letter addressed Mr. Payne on the subject of their Discussion, by which it will be seen that Mr. P. is now located; and having a house measurably at his own command, objections like those heretofore existing in relation to the Stamford house, must be obviated, and we hope some speedy arrangement will be made for resuming the debate.

To Rev. T. Payne.

Sir—It is with pleasure that I learn that you have become pastor of the Presbyterian church in Rye. As the house in which you worship is sufficiently spacious to accommodate a respectable audience, I can see no obstacle in the way now to prevent our resuming our controversy.

It is my wish to resume the discussion between us as soon as you may find it convenient. Will you therefore have the goodness to make that wish known to the Trustees of your Church, and use your influence with them, to grant us an opportunity of another hearing and communicate the result to me through the same medium that contains this note.

There are several reasons that induce me to prefer this method of corresponding, one of which is, I have no secrets in regard to those subjects in which the public are equally interested.

Yours respectfully,

S. J. HILLYER.

Brooklyn, April 2d, 1834.

RELIGIOUS INQUIRER AND GOSPEL ANCHOR.

Brs. Sperry and Grew, have just closed arrangements to unite these two papers, and they now appear in one, under the title "Religious Inquirer and Gospel Anchor." Arrangements have also been effected by which the list of the "Christian Bower" published at Keesville is transferred to them, and the services of Br. Bradley, the editor of the Bower, secured to the Inquirer and Anchor. The first number we have just received. It is in the same form and on the same sized sheet as the Messenger, presents a very handsome appearance, and is well filled with original matter. It will be published simultaneously in Hartford and Albany.—B. Sperry, Publisher; H. J. Grew, Editor, and C. F. LeFevre, I. D. Williamson, R. O. Williams, and J. Bradley, Associate Editors. Letters to be addressed to the Editor at Albany, or the Publisher at Hartford, as may be most convenient.

We are much pleased with the appearance of the paper, and cannot but wish our brethren success equal to their exertions in the cause of religious freedom.

P.

✉ Br. C. F. LEFEVRE's residence is at "No. 35 McDougal-street, New-York." His friends will hereafter please address all letters and papers to him at that place.

✉ The Wednesday Evening Lectures at the Calhoun hill st. church have been discontinued.

THE METHODIST PAPER.

Under this head, in another part of the present paper will be found an article from Br. Hillyer, touching the conduct of the editors of the Christian Advocate and Journal, in relation to the controversy between Messrs. Morse and Lee. Br. H. draws the line somewhat close, it is true, at the conclusion of his article, and yet we are not sure that it is not all deserved. The Methodist editors stand, at least, in a singular position. In the first place they partially pledge the publication of the whole controversy, that is, "if the articles are ably and judiciously written, and in a good spirit." Subsequently they continue their own side of the question—complain that the Universalist side was not sent to them in manuscript, (when Br. Morse was under no obligation whatever to send in that way, as he had only engaged to have it published in the Utica paper,) arguing therefrom that they were fully absolved from all previous promises; nevertheless they might give Br. M.'s letter, if it come "in time," and was "respectful and courteous as the first." And then to cap the climax, in their paper of the 21st ult. they affirm that they should have continued both sides, had the paper been received, *in due time!* and this in the face of the fact that Br. Skinner had forwarded the papers once or twice, at least, with a special request for them to exchange, and in addition to this, the positive testimony, too, of Mr. Lee, their own champion, that he had a long time before particularly requested them to exchange with the Utica Magazine and Advocate, and they had flatly refused to do it!

There is still another singularity. In the article we copied week before last from their paper, one prominent objection to their publishing Br. Morse's letter was, that it made "nearly ten columns of the Evangelical Magazine and Gospel Advocate." Look at their consistency. They had previously published, (without one syllable of objection as to length,) Mr. Lee's letter, (which would make at least sixteen to eighteen columns of the Magazine and Advocate,) in reply to this very same letter of Br. Morse, which they now excuse themselves from publishing, because it makes nearly ten columns! Alas! for poor human nature, when blinded by partyism.

We have endeavored to give a correct view of the present situation of the business. If there is error in it, we shall gladly correct on being properly advised of it. We would not wittingly misrepresent any one. But we cannot, with present perceptions, so far expand our charities as to excuse the whole matter under consideration. In relation to Br. Hillyer, particularly, the editors are far from manifesting the open and frank conduct which should characterize the Christian. They have actually occupied more room, seemingly to divert attention, than would have been required to comply with his request. Is it not apparent that they count largely on their strength and influence—that they think they can tell their own story in their own way, through their thirty thousand papers, and it will all be well with them? If this is the case, we say to them in the language of inspiration, "let him who thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." Between eight and nine thousand numbers of the Magazine and Advocate are weekly distributed through the union, and about three thousand of our own are just at this time sent out weekly. These papers are read by a vast number of people, and it is impossible under all the circumstances, that the one-sided and partial course of the editors of the Christian Advocate and Journal should not be known to a considerable degree beyond the circle of Universalists. And we would respectfully suggest to the conductors of all our periodicals, the propriety of noticing this subject at large, and not only in this case, but in every other one, of gross injustice on the part of our opposers. It is the only resource we have against the uncandid treatment experienced from many of them. The voice of thirty or forty thousand weekly Witnesses of this kind, will sooner or later be heard with an appalling force.

If the Methodist editors have not already seen enough of the world to admonish them of the danger of attempting to coerce public opinion, in religious as well as civil concerns, we will venture, though their juniors, to advise them that *if a candid course, regardless of parties, or sects, or no sect at all, is ever the best, and the safest.* P.

MORE PREACHERS.

We owe an apology to Br. A. CASE, for neglecting to repeat the announcement in the New-Haven Examiner, a few weeks since, of his recent engagement in the ministry of reconciliation. But really occasions occur so frequently now for announcing new laborers that we are liable to overlook in some instances. In the instance of Br. Case, we

did not think for a moment but that we had noticed it, until a friend reminded us of the oversight. We cheerfully avail ourselves, however, of this opportunity to make amends, by saying, that he has recently entered the ministry and is now laboring in Connecticut, to very good acceptance, as far as we have learned. Our friends at Danbury have been talking of employing him. Whether any definite engagement has been closed we have not heard. He is we believe, from the county of Oswego, in this state.

We avail ourselves of this occasion, also, to notice another young brother who has recently entered the field of labor. We have not seen him announced as a preacher, but have noticed his appointments for lecturing in various parts of Connecticut, in the Connecticut papers. We allude to Br. FORDYCE HITCHCOCK. He is a native of Danbury, Conn. and is a young man, we believe, of unexceptionable character. We know nothing of his powers as a preacher, but trust he will make a workman "that needeth not to be ashamed."

May both of these brethren partake largely of the spirit and benevolence of their Master, and be abundantly sustained in all laudable efforts to impart instruction to others. P.

ANOTHER PREACHER.

We were waited upon last week by an individual of the name of JAMES M'LAURIN, whose credentials show him to be a Preacher in regular standing in the Christian denomination. Br. M'Laurin is a Scotchman by birth. He informs us that he arrived in this country in 1817; has been a travelling Preacher among the Methodists, (Philadelphia Conference) for nine years, and subsequently a preacher with the Christian denomination for two years. For some five or six months past he has not hesitated to declare the whole counsel of God in the final ingathering of all men, to holiness and happiness, in Christ their head. For one year of the period he has been with the Christians, he was located in Sussex co. and the past year in Hunterdon co. N. J. We know nothing of his character and standing except from the certificates he holds from the proper authorities of the Christian Church. These are flattering in their testimony. One is dated in April 1833, and the other last month, (March 8th, 1834.) It is his intention to be present at the Conference in Branchville, when we may know more in regard to him. Br. George Rodgers we are informed is particularly acquainted with him. We have been pleased in the brief interview we have had with him, and so far as he renders himself a creditable laborer in the field of our common Master, we most heartily wish him God-speed. P.

MOZART SACRED MUSIC SOCIETY.

We were highly gratified with the performances of this Young Society, to which, with a very respectable auditory, we had the pleasure of listening on Tuesday evening last in the Orchard st. Church.—The Society dates its existence perhaps some fifteen or eighteen months back. It was established we believe by a few young gentlemen connected with the Orchard st. Church, and for the very laudable purpose of filling and improving the choir. Many other young ladies and gentlemen have since become associated with them, and their number, we understand, now approximates to one hundred. Under the instruction of Mr. Demarest, they have made very flattering progress, and seem possessed of a zeal and perseverance that promises still higher and higher attainments. Their past success, we certainly think, should inspire them not only with courage, but with confidence for the future. S.

NEW PAPER.

We have barely room to acknowledge the receipt of a new Universalist paper, published at Concord, New-Hampshire, by Messrs. Kimball and Adams, entitled "Star in the East, and New-Hampshire Universalist." The Star and Universalist is to be devoted to the interests of Universalism. The editor is not yet announced. It is issued every Saturday on a medium sheet, folio form, at \$1.50 in advance, or \$2 at the end of the year. The first number presents a good appearance.

RENTING OF PEWS.

The renting of the Pews in the Orchard-st Church will be continued on next Monday evening, commencing at half past 7 o'clock.

CONCERT OF SACRED MUSIC,

Wednesday evening, April 16.

In the Lombard-st. Universalist Church.

Tickets 25 cts.—To be obtained of W. B. Fairchild, 46 South-2d; G. H. McCully, 216 South-2d; Saml. White, Market above 10th; H. A. Beck, corner of North-2d and Pegg; of the Sections of the Lombard and Callowhill-st. churches, respectively; and of A. C. T.

THE BIBLE. Lecture at the Lombard-st. Universalist Church To-morrow (Sunday) evening. Subject: The claims and general character of the Bible, and the morality of the New Testament.—Services to commence at a quarter before 8 o'clock.

Particular Notice.

The patrons of the "Herald and Watchman" will bear in mind that they must advise us immediately, if they wish the Messenger continued to them. See last No.

To Correspondents.

The request of L. P. Guilford, will probably be attended to next week.

We acknowledge our obligations to Br. I. D. Williamson, Albany, for an excellent Sermon. We shall avail ourselves of the earliest opportunity to present it to our readers. It may be delayed a short time, as we are anxious to get the 'Answers' to the 213 Questions, now publishing, into as few papers as possible.

Br. T. B. T. is doubly welcome again. We apprehended he had forgotten us.

Will not our valued friend, formerly 'S. A. M.' now 'S. A. D.' occasionally remember the 'Messenger' in a leisure hour? We should be happy in hearing from her again as a contributor as often as may be consistent with other duties.

We tender our thanks to Br. R. Streeter for the very acceptable package just received from him, particularly for "The Other Half Sermon." We shall give early insertion to them.

Favors are also gratefully acknowledged from Br. LeFevre, Br. Moore, Reading, and our young friend at Easton.

"Doctrines, No. 6," is necessarily crowded by.

Married,

In Philadelphia, on the evening of March 20, by Ev. A. C. Thomas, Mr. CHARLES T. YERKS and Miss ELIZABETH BROOM, both of the Northern Liberties.

In New-York on Wednesday Evening, 2d inst. by the Rev. Mr. Chase, Mr. GEORGE JESSUP, of New York, and Miss JEMIMA JESSUP, of Hudson.

In Granby, Conn. on the 18th inst. by the Rev. Charles Spear, Mr. ALBERT CASE, of New Haven, and Miss PHEBE EVELINE CASE of the former place.

Died,

In Catskill, on the 26th ult. Mrs. Lucretia Baldwin, aged 66. Mrs. B. was on a visit to some friends in Troy, when she was taken sick, and being anxious to return home, she was removed. At this time she was not regarded dangerous, but she survived only a day or two after her return. Mrs. B. we understand, was an exemplary woman, had not hesitated in health and prosperity, to acknowledge Jesus the Saviour of all, and in the hour of death was firm and unwavering, rejoicing in the full conviction that she should unite with a ransomed world in hymning ceaseless praises to her Father and her God.

Religious Notices.

Br. S. J. Hillyer will preach in North-Salem, Sunday, April 13th; in Trumbull Sunday, 20th.

Br. John Gregory, will preach at Rondout Sunday 13th.

Br. R. O. Williams will preach in Sing-Sing, Sunday 13th (to-morrow.)

Conference.—A conference of Universalists will be held at Branchville, N. J. on the first Saturday and Sunday in May next. Ministering brethren are particularly invited to attend.

Brunswick Discussion.

Just received at this office, a "Report of the Discussion at Brunswick, June 17, between Rev. J. P. Kendall, and C. F. LeFevre, to which is added a friendly letter to Rev. J. P. Kendall, by Henry J. Grew." For sale at the very low price of six cents for sixteen pages.

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1834.

CONVERSION.

It is not common with our papers to notice individual cases of conversion, to our doctrine, unless it may be from the Partialist ministry. Scarcely a Limitarian paper, however, can be taken up, in which there is not a *revival* account of the "mighty work of the Lord" in some far-off land, under which the poor Universalists have fallen by scores. All this is artfully spread out before Limitarians, while at the same time the fact is carefully concealed that there is probably *five thousand* leaving the ranks of partialism and embracing Universalism, where there is even *one* professed Universalist adopting Partialism. Still Universalists have forbore to particularize in reply. They have rather rested securely in the full consciousness that their strength was rapidly (though silently) accumulating, and that it would ere long speak out to other denominations, the proportion of conversions, in a language that they were now incapable of uttering. We have approved this course. We still approve of it; but yet there may be exceptions. Cases of more than usual interest may occur in which we should be fully justified in stopping and contemplating them for a few moments in our public course. There is one, we think, of this class, of recent occurrence. It is that of a lady in this city, of very respectable standing, who has been a zealous member of a Baptist church, for upwards of *thirty years*. She is somewhat advanced in life, but God has been pleased in his providence to visit her, even in the down-hill of life, with the light of his salvation, and the measure of her joy is full and running over. It is but a few weeks since she began to perceive the first glimmer, to her mind, of the purpose of her heavenly Father in reconciling a world of erring children to himself, and she is now emphatically "rejoicing with a joy *unspeakable*, and full of glory." It is gladdening to our hearts to see one after another thus breaking the galling bands of prejudice, and coming out into the clear sun-light of that liberty wherewith Christ "maketh free."

We cannot better exhibit the joy and happiness now experienced by the individual in question, than in presenting some extracts, which we have been permitted to make, from a letter under date of the 3d inst. which she addressed to a brother in the western part of this state. She mentions the fact that her husband had brought into the house the Messenger and some small pamphlets, and then observes:

"I looked at one a little, but was of opinion that it was all *poison*. I however, read a little farther, and it appeared not quite so *bad* as I had at first imagined. I next went to meeting with my husband. I did not like it at first. I knew not how to give up sentiments I had so closely held for *thirty years*. My dear brother, you know how I loved my society—I do yet. We are in peace and love together; but I am going to tell them of their errors. They will no doubt consider me in the wrong, yet I think it will work for good. My dear brother and sister, I do trust that I feel thankful to our heavenly father who has convinced me of my errors. I now go with my husband, and love to go. Praise the Lord with me; try to live to His honor and glory; acknowledge Him in all your ways, and He will direct all your paths.

"God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform."

I do not know how to stop here.

"O, that all the world did know,"

Then

"All the world would love him too."

She had previously been informed that the brother to whom this letter was addressed had become a Universalist. She expresses the regret she then felt, and the apprehensions of a beloved sister, that their brother had lost *all religion*, and was rapidly going down to hell, and dragging his family after him, and then she continues:

"I now long to hear from you, though your friends think you crazy. I am sure if any one had told me but a few weeks ago that I should be a Universalist, I should have as soon expected to be crazy myself. But I think I am in my right mind, sitting at the feet of Jesus, desiring to be taught of Him. Now, dear brother, my

love extends, not merely to *one* society, as formerly, but to the whole family of man."

We most heartily congratulate, not only our sister, for the joyful emancipation she has experienced, but our aged brother, for the increased joys of the domestic circle. May God abundantly sustain them both, in their declining years, with the rich consolations of the Gospel of Peace. P.

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

[From the Philadelphian of April 3]

To Mr. Abel C. Thomas—Letter 5.

Philadelphia, April 3d, 1834.

Dear Sir—I have refrained from replying to many things contained in your letters, not from disrespect, but from a desire to avoid undesirable length in any one of my communications. At present I will refer to some of your past quotations and remarks.

To prove that there shall be no punishment beyond the present life, you have quoted Prov. xi, 31. "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner."—Now it will not follow from the fact that the righteous and the wicked meet with a suitable recompense on *THE EARTH*, that they will not also meet with a similar course of dealing from their Maker in the future state of existence. The fact of their being recompensed *here*, furnishes one of the strongest probabilities that they will also be recompensed *hereafter*, for why should God who now makes the way of transgressors hard, render it in future any more pleasant? If his justice and goodness now require him to punish transgressors and reward the obedient, these attributes remaining the same will forever secure similar results. An unchanging God, whose principles of moral government are fixed, and who recompenses men according to their conduct now, will certainly treat men according to their respective characters in all future times. Before this passage can be of any avail to the cause of Universalism, it must be shown that God fully, and perfectly punishes all the wicked, and all sinners, in the earth for all the sins they have committed or ever will commit, so that justice can inflict no more penalty upon them.

It is not true, that in *THE EARTH*, or in the present life, perfect distributive justice takes place.—The righteous, as a general rule, find wisdom's ways to be pleasantness, and godliness to be profitable unto all things; but still there are numerous instances in which they are injured and oppressed, and spend nearly the whole of their lives in suffering. On the other hand, the wicked generally experience the way of transgressors to be hard, and vice to bring in itself much misery; and yet in many cases the wicked prosper, triumph, and die, with their bones full of marrow, and with hearts at ease in stupidity. The text cited from Proverbs therefore cannot mean that in this world God makes a final end of recompensing either the righteous or the wicked. Did he make a full and final retribution it could not be said that "MUCH MORE" will he recompense "the wicked and the sinner." Perfect retribution in each case, would preclude the possibility of such a comparison. He will to a certain extent, and as a general law of his proceedings, recompense the righteous in the earth; but *much more*, to a greater extent, and more invariably will he recompense the wicked in the earth. This corresponds exactly with the experience of mankind, for God does more uniformly punish sin, than reward virtue in this life. The Lord's dealings with us, show, that he loves obedience and hates transgression; that it shall be well with the righteous, and ill with the wicked; and that from his imperfect retribution begun and carried on in this world, a perfect consummation of distributive justice, may be expected in the day of judgment.

That salvation is "the gift of God," to all of those who are saved, and results not to them from the merit of their own good works is granted, so that no man should boast, but ascribe all the glory of his being pardoned, sanctified and glorified in heaven, to "our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us."

The passage of Scripture on which you seem to rely with the greatest confidence is Colossians ii. 19, 20, 21. "It pleased the Father, that in him should all fullness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you that

were sometime alienated, and enemies, in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled." I am not indeed, disposed to deny that he must be happy who becomes reconciled to God, by a change in his state and mental operations, so that he is a pardoned sinner and loves God. But you insist that *ALL THINGS* are to be reconciled; and seem to think they will be, or now are so reconciled as to become happy. "In my judgment," you say, "this passage distinctly teaches the final holiness and happiness of all mankind—inasmuch as it teaches the *reconciliation of all things to God*." *ALL THINGS*, are words, which if taken without restriction mean more than *ALL PERSONS*. Every object of conception, and every act of mind, is a *THING*. You surely do not mean to insist, that the stones of the street, the birds of the air, the cattle of the hills, the air we breathe, the winds and waves are to be reconciled to God, in any such sense, as to render them capable of endless happiness. Inanimate objects are not capable of being reconciled to God, in the exclusive sense of which you write, meaning a reconciliation in mental, moral, and legal estate, or in disposition of mind; and yet they come under the general class of "all things." *Not all things*, absolutely, are to be reconciled to God, then, in any such sense as to secure to them everlasting or even any happiness. If there is any single thing, a man, an apple, or a pebble to be excluded from the class of all things to be reconciled, so as to be happy, your argument from absolute *universality* in this passage is lost. *Reconciliation* here must mean something different from a change of mental or moral state, preparatory to future bliss, or else the *all things* to be reconciled must be understood in a restricted sense. You may take which of these alternatives you choose. If you say that a *thing*, may be reconciled to God, without being secure of everlasting happiness, then I subjoin that the sinner may be that thing, and may in the sense of the text be reconciled to God, without ever being happy. If you say that *all things* are to be understood as denoting something less than absolute *universality of being*; then I add that God will undoubtedly reconcile unto himself all the persons and all the things that are to be reconciled unto himself.

Moreover the holy angels, which have not sinned are comprehended under the expression *all things*; and they being referred to, as 'things in heaven,' have no need of such *reconciliation* as consists in a change of estate from condemnation to pardon; or a change of mind from rebellion to submission, from enmity to love. Hence we infer, that the *reconciliation* here spoken of, does not necessarily imply any such change as is requisite to prepare the wicked for heaven, by making them holy in heart and life.

It would be easy to show from the most learned lexicographers, and commentators, that the word rendered *reconcile* primarily signifies to *change any thing from one state to another*; and hence, secondarily, when a man's mind is changed from enmity to love, in relation to any one, he is said to be *reconciled* to that individual. It is the primary sense of the word that is employed when it is said, the Greek being literally translated, "For it seemed good, that in him all fullness should dwell, and to reconcile all things to him, he having made peace through the blood of his cross; by him, whether the things on the earth, or the things in the heavens." In consequence of Christ's having died on the cross to complete the work of Redemption, it pleased God that in him as Mediator all the fullness of the Godhead should dwell, and that all things should be transferred to his dominion; so that he should be head over all things to his church. Dr. McKnight considers it a correct expression of the original to say *unite* instead of *reconcile* all things to him.

There is yet another interpretation which would make the word *reconcile*, mean nothing more than laying the foundation for actual reconciliation.—Thus it is said, "if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God," i. e. we were *atoned for*, or the ground work of reconciliation was done; "by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled" in our hearts and state, "we shall be saved by his life." Rom. v. 10. Here sinners for whom the price of redemption is paid, are said to be reconciled to God, while they yet continue in a state of enmity; but subsequently they become actually reconciled by the renewing of their minds.

You refer to Collos. i, 16—18, in which it is said of the "Image of the invisible God," that "by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that

are in earth:—*all things* were created by him and for him: and he is before *all things*, and by him *all things* consist. And he is the Head of the body, the Church—that in *all things* he might have the pre-eminence." In these five instances you think I will allow the expression *all things* to be unlimited; and ask why then I should limit the declaration immediately after made concerning God's reconciling *all things*. I answer, that the *all things* created, are limited to all *creatures*; for while *all creatures* were made by him, there are some things in existence which were not made by him; such as the essence of the Deity, infinite space and the actions of free agents. He is before *all things* that ever began to be, but not before *all things* absolutely, for that would make him to be before himself.

That all unbelievers as well as believers shall be reconciled to God, so as eventually to be holy and happy, you argue from 2 Cor. v, 18, 19, in which place we read, "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us [believers] to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself not imputing their trespasses unto them." Because God is in Christ, by his word and Spirit reconciling the world to himself, it does not follow that every individual of the world of mankind now is, or ever will be, actually reconciled. The process of reconciliation is going on in the world but it has not been consummated. So far as Christ actually reconciles men to himself in the state of their souls, he does not impute their sins to them, but pardons them; but the ministry of reconciliation has not yet extended to every individual of the world of mankind, and therefore you have no reason to conclude that actual reconciliation has outstripped the progress of the means. *The world* and the *whole world* frequently mean any complete system of things; and hence we read of a *world of iniquity* in the tongue, of a *world lying in sin* from which the apostles and saints were exempted; and of the *world* gone after Christ, while multitudes never went after him. There is a world of believers and a world of unbelievers.

In Philippians ii, 9, 11, we are informed, that in consideration of his work of redemption God hath highly exalted Christ, "and give him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Hence you infer the *universality* of holiness and happiness. You have forgotten that some *confessed* Christ and *bowed the knee* before him acknowledging him to be the glory of God the Father, who said, "Jesus, thou Son of God, art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" The bended knee is but an external token of subjection; and when some shall say, "Lord, Lord, open to us," to be told "depart accursed," they will confess Christ in such a way that God the Father will be glorified in their damnation. We grant that "whoso offereth praise glorifieth" the Lord: but equally true it is that the wrath of man shall praise the Lord: and the remainder thereof, or that which would not glorify him, he will restrain.

No man can say, from the heart, with faith, hope and love, that *Jesus is the Lord*, but by the *Holy Ghost*; but a parrot might say "Jesus is the Lord," without the least intelligence, and a man may say it with as little meaning as a parrot, ten thousand times, and then perish forever. As "no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed," so no man makes a truly evangelical confession of the supreme Deity of Jesus, who has not been savingly taught and renewed by the Holy Spirit.

In your letter of March 15th, you assure me "that Universalists sincerely believe all that the Bible says about everlasting punishment;" and yet you hold that the Bible says nothing about it!

You think Luke xiii, 1—5 proves that unless men repent, they shall perish "IN LIKE MANNER," as those perished on whom the tower in Siloam fell, or those persons whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices. Can you believe, that if men do not repent in this life, they shall all come to their death by some violent means; by the fall of a house, or by some bloody persecutor? If this were the case, we should regard such a general rule, of perishing from the earth as a strong indication of everlasting vengeance. We regard the declaration, that those who do not repent shall *all likewise* perish, as teaching nothing about the mode of their natural death. It

simply means, that those who repent not shall so PERISH, being taken away in God's displeasure, by whatever death, as those persons on whom the tower in Siloam fell, or those persons whom Pilate murdered in the midst of their religious rites.—Here the *perishing* or *perdition* threatened must refer to something else than the mode of dying, if all who repent not shall perish, as you agree in "like manner" as they perished. That you are correct in your explanation of the word *likewise* in the passage under consideration is admitted; for although the English word *likewise* frequently signifies also, yet the two Greek words, *osautos* and *homoios** which are translated *likewise* in verses 3d and 5th of Luke xiii, certainly denote the perishing to be *in like manner*. They who perished in consequence of the falling of the tower of Siloam, and the cruelty of Herod, were not worse than other sinners, who live to old age and die in their beds: but, says our Savior, *except ye repent, ye shall all perish*, as they perished; for he who dies without repentance, perishes from the gracious presence of the Lord.

You aim "to show that premature natural death, was the declared consequence of iniquity, according to the representation of Solomon," and that this is the *perdition* denounced against the wicked, when it is said they shall perish. It is granted, that frequently the wicked do not live out half their days, which they might live, were they moral in their conduct; and that in general, obedience in childhood, and virtuous conduct in after life, tend to prosperity and length of days. Still we read of a sinner's being accursed, when an hundred years old; Isa. lxx, 20; and our own observation must have taught us, that many sinners, instead of coming to a premature death, die in old age, in their iniquities, "being wholly at ease and quiet."

The 1 Cor. xv, 22, proves nothing more than this, that in and through Adam, all mankind have become subject to natural death, and that in and through Christ, all men shall be raised from the dead at the last day. Paul is arguing against those who denied the resurrection from the dead, and he asserts that the resurrection through Christ, shall be as extensive, as death by Adam. *As in Adam all die*, says he, *even so in Christ shall all be made alive*; and he is careful to add, in the next verse, "but every man in his own order." Now, in this order, Christ arose as the first fruits; afterward shall arise they that are Christ's, at his coming; and finally all the wicked shall arise to immortality and damnation at the same time. Then all things, and among them death itself shall be subdued to Christ, without entering heaven.

Some shall as certainly be made alive in, or by Christ to an immortality of misery, as others to an immortality of blessedness. In proof of this doctrine of a resurrection from the grave to a future judgment, and of some men to all the miseries of hell, in body and in spirit for ever, I adduce the following texts.

"Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars, for ever and ever." Dan. xii, 2, 3. Here among those who are to arise from their graves, there is to be a distinction between those who are wise and all the unwise. The wise, are to shine with different degrees of glory, according to the measure of their holy obedience, and are to experience everlasting life, while all persons of an opposite character are to be the subjects of shame and everlasting contempt.

In the fifteenth Psalm, we have a prophetic description of the future general judgment. *Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath already shined in the glory of his gospel, which reveals to us, the end of the world. Our God shall come, in awful majesty, as a destroying fire and tempest to the wicked. But in relation to others, he shall say to his angels, "Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice. And the heavens shall declare his righteousness, for God is judge himself."*

Concerning this scene, "Enoch, also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, —saying, behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to exe-

cute judgment upon all; and to convince all that are ungodly among them, of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him, Jude v, 14, 15. When the ungodly are thus convinced, and judgment is executed upon them, every mouth will be stopped; every knee will bow, every tongue will confess, and God will be glorified in manifesting his justice, goodness and forbearance, even in relation to the sinner's doom.

In Jude, we also read, concerning the Lord, that "the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." Likewise, also, these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despite dominion, and speak evil of dignities." These Jude or Judas, the brother of James, styles "wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever." Here the spirit of inspiration gives us instances of endless punishment in the angels who sinned; in the inhabitants of the plain of Sodom, who suffer, after the shower of fire had swept them from the earth, the *vengeance of eternal fire*; and in those ungodly men in the days of Judas, who denied the only Lord God, turned the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and were ordained to condemnation.

In 2 Cor. v, 8—10, Paul says, that he is willing to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord, for which presence "we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him: for we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." Here our appearing before the judgment seat of Christ, is represented as taking place after our spirits are unclothed of the earthly house of this tabernacle, and clothed upon with an house not made with hands, so that mortality is swallowed up. When we live to die no more, having risen from the grave, then shall we all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that we may receive our portion for ever.

"God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Eccle. xii, 14. "God shall judge the righteous and the wicked." Eccle. iii, 17.

"In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel," saith Paul, then "as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law,"—"for there is no respect of persons with God," Rom. ii, 11, 12, 16. In this same chapter, Paul says, "we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth," and then exhorts to a preparation for it, as a future "revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render unto every man according to his deeds." He does not affirm that God does it now, but that he will do it, in that day of wrath, against which, by their hardness and impenitent hearts, many treasure up wrath; in that day, in which he will render glory, honor, immortality, eternal life, to them that patiently continue in well doing; in that day, in which he will render to the contentious who do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, "tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil."

Paul told the Athenians, that God "hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained," Acts, xvii, 31. If the day of judgment was the day of giving the law, or any time prior to the Apostle's teaching the Athenians, there was no propriety in saying, that God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world. In that case, he might have said, "he has judged the world, without appointing any day for the judgment."

As an inducement to men to deny themselves, take up the cross and follow him, Jesus said, in reference to gaining the world and losing one's own soul, "for the son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then shall he reward every man according to his work." Matt. vi, 27. Then, when he shall thus come, and not before, will he perfectly reward every man. In proof of his coming to judge the world in the last day, agreeably to this declaration, Jesus then informed his disciples that they should not all die, before he would

* We have not the Greek type in the office, and neither can we lay our hand at this moment on the proper accented letters to express these terms correctly.—Eds. Messenger and Universalist.

come in his spiritual kingdom on earth. "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." John lived to see the full establishment of Christianity in the world; and the Saviour's coming to judge Jerusalem and call the Gentiles; but this was a widely different thing from his coming to judge the world in the last day.

I shall refer you, at present to one other passage, of fearful import, and in my opinion, conclusive on the subject of our controversy.

"It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day," 2 Thes. 1, 6-10. "In that day," the day of final judgment, "when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe," THEN "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power." In this way Christ will recompense tribulation to those who persecute his people, and rest to those who suffer trouble for his sake. Thus to give sinners and saints, persecutors and the persecuted, their respective portions, is a "righteous thing with God."

I accuse you, sir, of no prevarication nor of intentional misrepresentation; and thank you for the repeated instances in which you have given me advice concerning the manner in which I ought to manage my part in this discussion; but really this last passage of the word of God which I have cited must for ever prevent me from becoming a Universalist. I remain yours respectfully,

EZRA STILES ELY.

To Mr. E. S. Ely.—Letter 5.

Philadelphia, April 7, 1834.

Dear Sir—I am much pleased with the spirit and general tenor of your last letter. Controversialists have frequently allowed a difference of opinion to engender feelings of animosity, which have been evinced in their deportment one toward the other; and thus, instead of subserving the interests of truth, they have embittered their own reflections, caused heart-felt sorrow in their friends, and furnished grounds for reproach to the despisers of the Gospel of Christ. I sincerely hope that in the discussion of the question before us, we shall be enabled to convince the controversial world, that opponent opinions do not necessarily involve the creation of opponent feelings.

You commence your letter with some remarks on Prov. xi, 31—which passage I quoted without comment, in my Bible creed. Before I proceed to examine the bearing of those remarks, allow me to observe, that the question is, simply, "Is the doctrine of endless punishment taught in the Bible? or does the Bible teach the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?" You are not required to prove, by direct argument, that the wicked are *not* fully recompensed in this world, nor am I required to prove that they *are*. You are called upon to show that endless punishment is a doctrine of the Bible—in which event it will of course be established, that the wicked are not adequately recompensed in the present life. And I have engaged to prove the final holiness and happiness of all mankind—in which event it will follow, that the doctrine of endless punishment is false.

When it is said, "the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth," we are to understand that they shall be recompensed *only in part*, in this life? A recompense is a compensation, a countervail, an equivalent. When you engage men to labor for you, with the assurance that they shall be recompensed in Philadelphia, you do not suppose it necessary to use the word "*fully*;" nor do they imagine that a part of their recompense will be paid in Boston. Whether it be paid to day, or to-morrow, or next week, it must be paid in Philadelphia—or your assurance is void. Now the simple declaration, that "the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth," is equally emphatic with your supposed assurance above noticed. "In the earth," then, the righteous shall be recom-

pensed—that is, they shall, in the earth, receive a reward equivalent to their labors of love.

You lay considerable stress on the phrase, "*much more*," and so do I—but our inferences are widely different. It appears to me that the expression is used by way of emphasis. Let us compare a few passages.

Luke xii, 28. "If then God so clothe the grass which is to day in the field, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, how *MUCH MORE* will he clothe you, O ye of little faith?" Here a *fact* is stated, viz. that God *does* clothe the grass of the field—and the words "*much more*" were introduced to render the conclusion more *emphatic*, viz. that God would *certainly* clothe the disciples. So in Matt. viii, 11—"If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how *MUCH MORE* shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" Here the phrase "*much more*" is plainly used by way of emphasis. Even parents who are evil give good gifts to their children. From this *fact* Jesus argued that God would *certainly* give good things to them who ask him. Neither fact is contravened by the other.

So in the text. It is a fact that "the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth," and the *certainly* that such shall also be the case with "the wicked and the sinner," is rendered emphatic by the use of the words "*much more*." Throughout the chapter of which this passage is a portion, the blessedness of the righteous and the wretchedness of the wicked, in the present life, are placed in contrast—and the whole is concluded with the language under consideration.

The fact, then, that the wicked are "*recompensed here*," furnishes [not only] one of the strongest probabilities [but one of the strongest proofs] that they will "*not*" be recompensed *hereafter*" for the sins of this life.

I have ever contended that "the way of transgressors is hard," and that so long as man is sinful, just so long he will be miserable. But you assume that some of mankind will be sinful in the future state—which I desire you to attempt to prove by the Bible. Rom. vi, 7.

You say, "an unchanging God, whose principles of moral government are fixed, and who recompenses men according to their conduct now, will certainly treat men according to their respective characters in all future times." But you have informed us that neither the righteous nor the wicked are adequately recompensed in *this* world—and so, according to your analogical reasoning, you should allow that they *never* will be thus recompensed—for "the principles of the [Divine] moral government are fixed." If an "imperfect retribution" now, is consequential on *fixed* principles, why should you analogically argue a subsequent perfect retribution?

It is true, that many of those denominated the righteous are called to endure much suffering; and many of those who are popularly styled the wicked seem to prosper in their outward concerns—but the former would not consent to exchange situations with the latter, even supposing this life to close the existence of both. I have no reason to doubt that

"Oft shining cares in rich brocades are drest,
And diamonds sparkle on the anxious breast;
That the wicked are like the troubled sea that cannot rest,
Whose waters cast up mire and dirt—there is no peace to the wicked, saith my God;" that though a man accumulate wealth, and be crowned with all the honors and plaudits of the world, if he be not a disciple of the Lord Jesus, peace is a stranger to his mind, and his soul is the scene of conflicting passions, which cannot but render him an object of pity rather than of condemnation.

On the other hand, I have as little reason to doubt, that

"The soul's calm sunshine, and the heart-felt joy
Is virtue's prize;" that the sufferings not consequent on guilt are incidental to our mortal existence; that happiness is primarily dependent on the state of the mind; and that he who learns of Jesus, will find rest to his soul. "In keeping the commandments there is great reward." "Great peace have they who love thy law, and *nothing* shall offend them." They enjoy a peace which all the blandishments of the world must ever fail to yield; and which the frowns and reverses of fortune can never take away. Christian! is not this the record of thy experience?

Your remarks on Col. i, 19, 20, do not, in my judgment, weaken the force of the text in proof of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind. You allow that "he must be happy who is reconciled to God, by a change in his state and mental operations, so that he is a pardoned sinner and loves God." Now that the reconciliation signified in the declaration, "by him to reconcile all things to himself," is of this character, appears evident from the consideration, that it is immediately added, "And you *HATH* he reconciled." The reconciliation in the one case must be of the same general character as that of the other. The believers who *had* been

reconciled, were a kind of first fruits of the all things which it pleased the Father to reconcile to himself.

Reconciliation always supposes previous *unreconciliation*. If "the stones of the street, the birds of the air, the cattle of the hills, the air we breathe, or the winds and waves," were ever *unreconciled*, they are embraced in the all things to be reconciled—but not otherwise. None but rational beings can be unreconciled—and of course none but rational beings can be reconciled in the sense of the text. Those who *had* been reconciled were of the same race of beings intended by the phrase all things. "And you that were sometimes *alienated* and *enemies* in your minds by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled." If "an apple, a pebble, the essence of Deity, infinite space, and the actions of free agents," were never *alienated* and never *enemies* by wicked works, then they are not among the all things to be reconciled.

When Jesus said, "preach the Gospel to every creature," do you suppose he intended the message to be delivered to "the stones of the street, or to the cattle of the hills?" John writes as follows: "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." Rev. v, 13. Do you suppose this eulogium was pronounced by the birds of the air, the winds and waves, or the fishes of the sea? Do you suppose it was pronounced by any other than rational beings? Yet the phrase "*every creature*" is used. Professor Stuart of Andover, in his Letters to Channing, p. 100 says, "Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers for the Universe, (*ta pan, or ta panta*.)" I may remark that *ta panta* is used in the text, and is translated *all things*. Dr. Geo. Campbell, whose orthodoxy you will not question, says, in speaking of the periphrasis mentioned by Stuart, that it includes "*the whole rational creation*." Diss. vi, part ii, sec. 6. You thus perceive that the "all things" to be reconciled includes those only who can be unreconciled—viz. the whole rational creation.

You give us a primary and a secondary sense of the word *reconcile*, and suppose that the primary sense is employed in the text. Your secondary sense is thus stated: "When a man's mind is changed from enmity to love, in relation to any one, he is said to be *reconciled* to that individual." This surely is the sense in which the word is used in the passage under consideration—for the Apostle says, "And you that were sometime *alienated* and *enemies*, in your minds by wicked works, yet now *hath* he reconciled." Their minds were changed from enmity to love. And this is the change denoted in the declaration, "by him to reconcile all things to himself"—for I have shown that the reconciliation in one case must be of the same general character as that of the other. Dr. Campbell, in his note on Matt. v, 9, quotes Col. i, 20, and says that the word here used signifies "actively to reconcile, to make peace." And he adds, that "etymology and classical use also concur in affixing thereto the sense of *reconciler, peace-maker*."

The other interpretation which you mention cannot, I think, have any material bearing on the sense of the text.—You say, "There is yet another interpretation which would make the word *reconcile* mean nothing more than laying the foundation for actual reconciliation." The foundation for the reconciliation of all things is stated in the text—"And having made peace through the blood of his cross." Then follows the prospective result—"By him to reconcile all things to himself."

The tenor of Rom. v, 1-11 clearly shows, that in the death of Christ, the great love of God was manifested to a sinful world. So soon as any one was brought to realize this great love, and believe with all his heart, so soon he was reconciled to God. No one in a state of enmity can thus be reconciled, unless it be in a prospective sense. The Christians in Paul's time could safely and truly say, "We also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the reconciliation," or at-one-ment. "Being reconciled," they knew they should be saved from the wrath, tribulation and anguish that must come on every unreconciled soul. The death of Christ was unquestionably the foundation of reconciliation—for in his death the unbounded love of God was revealed. And it is in the Saviour's life that the believer lives. Hence says Paul, "Always bearing about in the body the *dying* of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body," 2 Cor. iv, 10.

2 Cor. v, 18, 19, considered in connexion with Col. i, 20, certainly argues the final reconciliation of the whole race of man. Be sure, "we see not yet all things put under him; but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." Heb. ii, 8, 9. It is true that the process of reconciliation has not yet been consummated—but ere the kingdom shall be delivered up to God the Father, all things shall be subdued unto Christ—the Son also shall be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. 1 Cor. xv.

In order to set aside my reasoning on Phil. ii, 9-11, you refer to the case of the two men who said, "What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" Matt. vii, 29. And you also inform me, that "a parrot might say 'Jesus is the Lord,' without the least intelligence," &c. But do you seriously suppose, that it would be "to the glory of God the Father," for a crazy man, a man possessed of demons, to say "Jesus, thou son of God?" Or do you suppose that a parrot which should say, without intelligence, "Jesus is Lord," would in

the least degree glorify God? The language of the text is explicit: "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Surely a confession of this description could not be to the glory of God the Father, unless it were grounded in the conviction of the understanding, and offered in sincerity of heart. In this manner, and with such feelings, no man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Spirit."

Professor Stuart, after commenting on the periphrasis before alluded to, says, "What can be meant by things in heaven, that is, beings in heaven, bowing the knee to Jesus, if spiritual worship be not meant?" And after noticing the same periphrasis in Rev. v. 13, he says, "If this be not spiritual worship, and if Christ be not the object of it here, I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine."

How any can "confess Christ in such a way that God will be glorified in their damnation," is beyond my conception; and you have certainly furnished no proof of the supposition that such will be the case. Beside the remarks already offered, allow me to repeat, that with whatever feelings one knee shall bow and one tongue confess, every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess—for the Apostle makes no distinction as to the manner or result.

The "wrath of man" can praise the Lord in no other way, than in being so over-ruled by the benevolent purpose of God as to furnish ground for thanksgiving and gratitude.

The paragraph of four lines, in which you endeavor to make it appear that I have contradicted myself in relation to the phrase "everlasting punishment," was inserted, in my judgement, without due reflection. Surely you do not suppose that I am unacquainted with the letter of the Bible.—Give me leave to assure you that we know what the Bible says about everlasting punishment; and to re-assure you "that Universalists sincerely believe" what it says. We also sincerely believe what it says about the everlasting priesthood of Aaron, the everlasting covenant of the law, the everlasting possession of Canaan, and about other everlasting things which have no reference to a future existence. In the light of these remarks you will perceive what it is your duty to perform, in relation to the phrase "everlasting punishment" in Matt. xxv. 46.

Your argument predicated on Luke xiii. 1-5, rests on two assertions—the one direct, and the other implied: 1st. That "he who dies without repentance, perishes from the gracious presence of the Lord," by which you mean, that such an one will be doomed to endless punishment; and 2d. That the Savior's language, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," is of universal application. The connexion of the passage shows that it was confined to the Jewish people.—So PEARCE—"Except ye, the nation of the Jews, repent, your state shall be destroyed." So ROSENMULLER—"This was fulfilled at the last passover, a most fatal day to the Jews." So CALMET—"Jesus Christ here predicts those calamities which overwhelmed them, when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans; for then very many impenitent and unbelieving Jews were buried together under the ruins of their most miserable nation." So also WHITBY, &c.

I think I succeeded in showing, in my last letter, "that premature natural death was the declared consequence of iniquity (as in Prov. xxix. 1,) according to the representation of Solomon." And I aimed to show, that language quoted from Solomon's writings, must be viewed in the light of this representation. As to the sinner being accursed when an hundred years old, you can draw no argument therefrom in proof of endless punishment—for it is written, "he that is hanged is accursed of God," Deut. xxi. 23, which language Paul quotes in reference to the crucifixion of our Lord, Gal. iii. 13. The same apostle says, "I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren," Rom. ix. 3.

In commenting on 1 Cor. xv. 22, you seem to have overlooked the declaration, that "even so IN CHRIST shall all be made alive." And Paul, as quoted in a former letter, declares, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things have passed away, behold all things have become new," 2 Cor. v. 17. In the light of this testimony, how can you suppose that some shall "be made alive in Christ to an immortality of misery?"

To justify yourself, you quote Daniel xii. 2, 3. The connexion of this passage is as follows: "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written on the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. When he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished."

In Matt. xxiv. 15, 21, our Savior quotes the prophet, Daniel, and refers the language above italicised to the period of the destruction of Jerusalem. "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet . . . then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains . . . for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, nor ever shall be." As our Savior thus fixed the reference of Daniel's language, it becomes us to avoid contradicting his testimony.

Compare Dan. xii. 2, 3, with Eph. v. 14, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." Also with Phil. ii. 15 . . . "In the midst

of a crooked and perverse generation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world."

You say, and properly, that Christ arose as the first fruits; afterwards shall arise they that are Christ's at his coming," but you add, "and finally all the wicked shall arise to immortality and damnation at the same time."—Of this however, the Apostle says not a word. His language is, as quoted in my last, "then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father . . . and when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that GOD MAY BE ALL IN ALL."

You affirm that "death itself shall be subdued to Christ, without entering heaven." Paul's declaration is not that death shall be subdued to Christ, but that death shall be destroyed, and swallowed up in victory.

"In the fiftieth Psalm," you say, we have a prophetic description of the future general judgment." It would have been becoming in you to have furnished the proof of such reference. The same remark is applicable to your quotation of Jude 14, 15. Similar language, in many respects, and equally terrific, is found in Isa. xiii. 6, 22. Joel ii. 1, 11. See also Psalm lvi. 13. There is nothing in any or all of these passages which is not perfectly referable to the things of time. Comp. Ps. 1, 5, and Matt. xxiv. 31 and connexion.

The fate of the angels [or messengers] who sinned, and that of Sodom and Gomorrah, are not to your purpose.—Jude adduces these instances of the judgement of God as examples to the "filthy dreamers," who disgraced the Christian Church. GILPIN aptly remarks, that the apostle mentions the destruction of the cities of the plain, "as a *deigma*, something that was a visible example to all." That word, deriving from *deiknumai*, to show or exhibit, properly signifies to give a sample of something to be sold. So also BENSON, HAMMOND, WHITBY. The phrase "even as" clearly shows that the case of the angels [or messengers] who sinned, was also adduced as a visible example. You will not pretend that torments in the invisible world, can be a visible example to men in the flesh. So soon as you evince a desire to enter fully into the consideration of this subject, as a part of the discussion, you will find me ready. You must not, however, assume as granted, that the inhabitants of Sodom suffered the vengeance of eternal fire "after the shower of fire had swept them from the earth"—nor must you assume that the angels mentioned in the preceding verse were super-human beings, nor that endless punishment was their doom.

If you will read 2 Cor. v. 10, without the words supplied by the translators, (which are always printed in *italic*, and for which there is no divine authority,) you will perceive that your argument therefrom in proof of a future general judgment is not so strong as you may have supposed.—Paul speaks of being *absent from the body*, and present with the Lord; but he also speaks of being *at home in the body*—and it was with reference to the latter situation that he said, "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things [not out of but] *IN BODY*, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad." He says in Gal. vi. 7, "For whatsoever a man soweth that also shall he reap." He who sows a field of grain in Pennsylvania, does not expect to reap the crop in France. He will reap where he sowed.

In Luke xxi our Savior, in discoursing of events connected with his coming to destroy Jerusalem, speaks of standing before the Son of man. All this was to be in the earth. Why then should it be supposed that the judgment seat of Christ is in the immortal world? Jesus told his disciples that he should come to judge the world—not that the people should go into the future state to be judged.

It is true, as you quote, that "God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing," Eccl. xii. 14; it is true that "God shall judge the righteous and the wicked," Eccl. iii. 17; and it is equally true that "He is a God who judgeth in the earth." Ps. lviii. 11.

In your comments on Rom. ii. you (unintentionally, I presume,) misquote verse 7. You make it declare that "God will render glory, honor, immortality, eternal life, to them that patiently continue in well-doing." The text reads thus: "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honor, immortality, eternal life." I have shown in previous letters that the believing ARE in possession of eternal life, and that "glory, honor, and peace" are the present consequences of right doing.

You rest much of your argument on the alteration above corrected, and also on the declaration, "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my Gospel." This declaration is nothing to your purpose, unless you prove that the day referred to appertains to a future existence. The expression, "the day of wrath," furnishes no such proof. In Zeph. i. we read "The great day of the Lord is near . . . that day is a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of trumpet and alarm against the fenced cities," &c. So we read in Rom. ii—"indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil." The former passage might be applied to a future state with as much propriety as you have thus applied the latter.

Acts xxii. 31, in my judgment, affords no proof of the position you quoted it to establish. Jehovah says, "I am the Lord which exercise loving-kindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth," Jer. ix. 24. God committed all judgment to the Son, John v. 22. It is recorded, Isa. xxxii. 1, "a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment;" Jesus said to his disciples, Luke

xxii. 29. "And I appoint you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." As God, who judgeth in the earth, committed all judgement to the Son, and appointed him a kingdom, it was requisite that a day (or time to reign) should also be appointed, (the Gospel day or dispensation, Isa. xlix. 8. 2 Cor. vi. 2,) in which God should judge (or rule) the world in righteousness by that man whom he had ordained. See Ps. xcvi. 10-13. "Say among the heathen that the Lord reigneth," &c. This surely does not argue that God himself had not previously judged the world in righteousness.

In quoting Matt. xvi. 27, 28, you suppose that verse 27 relates to a yet future coming of Christ to judge the world, while you acknowledge that verse 28 refers to his coming in his spiritual kingdom, to judge Jerusalem and call the Gentiles. But the proof of such a transition of reference in the cited verses remains to be produced. Our Lord frequently spake of his coming, and by comparing the language of the text with other passages, we shall arrive at some definite conclusion on the subject.

Luke xxi is chiefly devoted to the consideration of events connected with the coming of the Son of man—and all those events have a direct relation to the destruction of Jerusalem. "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh And there shall be signs in the sun, and the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." In the verses following, this coming is confined to the then existing generation. See verse 32.

In Matt. xxiv similar events are predicted, connected with the same coming "in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory," and the whole is expressly confined to the generation then existing. See verse 34.

In Matt. xvi. 27, 28, language of the same import is used.—"For the son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Before the close of the then existing generation, Jesus was to come in the kingdom which God had appointed him, and then was to begin the day appointed in which God was to judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he had ordained,—and in that day, also, Jesus, as the King who was to reign in righteousness, was to render to every man according to his works. This was the Gospel day—the day referred to in Rom. ii. etc.

I will only add, that the passage in question is explained as above by Pearce, Hammond, Rosenmuller, Dr. Adam Clarke, and others.

You rely with all confidence on 2 Thess. i. 6-10, as being "conclusive on the subject of our controversy." But if you will re-examine your remarks, you will perceive that the entire force of the passage in proof of endless punishment, depends on the supposition that "the day of final judgment" is referred to. You say, "IN THAT DAY, the day of final judgment," &c. The time specified by the Apostle is, "when he shall come;" "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven;" "I have already shown when Jesus was to come viz. before the close of the generation in which he lived. No doubt Paul's language, when written, had a future reference—but I cannot allow you to assume that it is yet future. Jesus said to his disciples, Luke xvii. 30, 31, "Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed. IN THAT DAY, he which shall be upon the house top, and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take it away; and he that is in the field, let him likewise not return back. Remember Lot's wife," &c. Similar directions are given in Matt. xxiv. 15-18. So also in Luke xxi. 20-23—in all which places the time of tribulation to Jerusalem is obviously referred to. Jesus said, "Then shall be great tribulation," and "These be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled." In 2 Thess. i. which you quote, it is written, "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them who trouble you taking vengeance on them that know not God," &c.

As the passage now under consideration was once a weapon in my hands in proof of endless punishment, and as it appears to be a prominent objection in your mind against Universalism, allow me to propose a full examination of its merits. Four questions present themselves. 1st. Who troubled the Thessalonians? for they were the persons to be punished in the manner stated. 1 Thess. i. 14-16. Acts xvii. 5-9. 2d. When were they to be punished? This question I have already attempted to answer. 3d. Where were they to be punished? "From the presence of the Lord," &c. The Jewish use of this phrase should receive due attention. 2 Kings xiii. 23. xxiv. 20. 4th. In what was the punishment to consist? "In everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord." Jer. xxiv. 39, 40. This is simply a sketch of the subject, which I am prepared fully to discuss, so soon as you feel disposed to furnish your proofs that the passage refers to the future state.

As this letter has already been extended beyond desirable limits, I defer the presentation of additional testimony in proof of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind. I wish not to quote a text without proceeding to show that it has the bearing I suppose it to have. And I may add, that a few passages to the point, are of more value than many of an equivocal or doubtful character.

With assurances of continued respect, I am yours, &c.

ABEL C. THOMAS.

FOR THE MESSENGER AND UNIVERSALIST.

MESSRS. EDITORS—You will confer a favor by giving the following a place in the Messenger. An incorrect copy was sometime since inserted in the Churchman.

A SUBSCRIBER.

A Paraphrase of the 3d Chapter of James. BY JOSEPH OSBORN.

Him may'st thou deem a perfect man, whose word
To give offence or pain was never heard;
Who rules his tongue, is master of the art,
To rule his passions and control his heart.

The impetuous steed bounds swiftly o'er the plains,
A slender bit his rapid flight restrains;
A slender bit directs his devious course,
Governs his movements, or subdues his force.

Behold the ship, through storm and tempest rave,
And mingle with the clouds the boisterous wave,
Obedient to the helm, securely glide
Where'er the pilot lists her course to guide.

E'en thus, the human tongue, in size so small,
With sov'reign sway impels and governs all;
Lo! from a spark, tremendous flames aspire,
And spread on every side destructive fire.

The human tongue, a fire destructive spreads,
And heaps a world of miseries on our heads.
Wide wasting pest, all nature feels thy sway;
From hell thou cam'st and all thy powers obey.

Whate'er or air, or earth, or water broods,
That fly, or creep, or walk, or cleave the floods,
Tam'd by man's care, confess his sovereign sway;
And passively his will or power obey.

But thou unruly tongue, no human power,
Can bridle or control a single hour;
Thou direst ill that human nature knows,
Thou deadly poison foe to life's repose!

By thee submissive mortals aid implore
Of God the Father, and his power adore,
Aided by thee, the fell, revengeful mind
Scatters dire curses on all human kind.

From the same impious mouth successive flow,
Blessings to God, curses to man below;
From the same fountain gurgling thro' the mead
Can sweet and bitter waters both proceed?

Say can the fig tree olive berries know,
Or on the vine the fig tree's fruitage grow?
So can no fountain to the thirsty field,
Waters, both salt and fresh together yield.

Is there, among you, one for wisdom famed,
With honor by the sons of science named?
In social converse be his worth essay'd
And wisdom's meekness in his works display'd.

But in your hearts if wicked passions dwell,
Or strife and bitter envy should rebel;
O, call not falsehood by truth's hallow'd name
Nor boast as glory, infamy and shame.

Such worldly wisdom comes not from the skies,
But sensual, devilish, low on earth it lies:
For where base envy, bitter strife prevail,
Confusion reigns, and evils dire assail;

But from above pure wisdom first descends,
And then to love, and peace, and wisdom bends;
Among her train good fruits and mercy smile,
Without partiality and void of guile.

They that make peace where strife before was known,
In peace the fruits of righteousness have sown.

Original.

THE GOODNESS OF GOD.

"O taste and see that the Lord is good: blessed is the man that trusteth in Him."

The goodness of God is a theme upon which we always delight to dwell, and from which we always derive pleasure and profit. Whenever we meditate upon it, or speak of it, we feel satisfied that we have spent the time to advantage, and we only regret that we have not more to spare, and more words wherewith to express our feelings in relation to this interesting subject. We only regret that we cannot more thoroughly arouse the attention of men to its importance, and more effectually send it home to their hearts, that they may see, and hear, and feel its holy and happy influence.

One great reason why mankind do not more truly love and serve God, is because they do not sufficiently reflect upon His goodness—because they do not acquaint themselves with His character and dealings. Did men study more

the ways of God, did they meditate more frequently upon His parental kindness, upon His mercies—in a word, did they but taste and see that the Lord was good, they would surely love Him, they would surely enter with willing hearts into His service, and bind His statutes upon their hearts forever, that they might go no more out of the way.

It is very strange, that people are so insensible to the great truth of God's universal and unwearying goodness, when every day and hour they are supported and made happy by it; when they see it above, below, and all around them. It is inconceivably strange, that they do not know and realize more of it, when it is so apparent in every thing about them; when they read its beautiful story in every object that meets the eye, or ear, or touch; when heaven, earth, seas, and all nature, are filled with it. For it is even so, the goodness of the Father is visible in every quarter; we are wholly surrounded with it. It

"Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
Glow in the stars, and blossoms in the trees;
Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
Spreads undivided, op'rates unspent."

How wonderfully strange, then, that men should be so little acquainted with it; that they should be so blind to that which is so apparent; so ignorant of that which every moment of life comes in contact with them and their duties. We should think it almost impossible that they could be so thoughtless—they who are the constant recipients of that goodness; they who live, and move, and have their being at its expense. But it is so, it is a melancholy fact, that mankind in general, are ungrateful; or to say no more, culpably indifferent in relation to the parental care and kindness of our heavenly Father. They forget the hand that feeds them, and turn away from Him who blesses them.

And why, we ask, is this neglect; this want of gratitude? Why is it, that mankind are so careless, so regardless of the Author of their happiness? The answer we have already given. They do not reflect sufficiently upon His goodness. They do not, as often as they should, call to mind His tender mercies, and the loving kindness with which He has watched, and still watches over them. And now the question arises—How is this evil to be remedied? How are we to bring them to a grateful remembrance of their Benefactor? How are we to make them deeply sensible of His untiring goodness, and lead them to love Him in return, and worship and serve Him with pure and humble spirits? The answer to this question, friendly reader, concerns us equally with others; it concerns all God's family, and it should therefore command our serious attention.

We believe there is but one way in which this most desirable object can be effected; and it is by bringing men, to look upon the character and goodness of God as they are, in all their native loveliness and perfection. We must, if we expect to create these correct views in the minds of men, we must continually speak to them of the goodness of God. We must preach it to them; we must converse with them of its excellencies; we must point it out to them, in objects where they have not been accustomed to see it; we must show them their entire dependance upon it, and how deeply they are interested in it; we must lay before them the picture of its thousand beauties; we must convince them that it is the great fountain which is continually sending out to them the waters of life freely; the fountain from which flows to their happiness, health, peace, comfort, and every good and perfect thing that they receive. Then we must open upon their vision the glories, the unutterable bliss of the immortal inheritance. We must labor with them, that they may, as far as mortals can, realize the riches of God's

mercy, as displayed in the final gathering in of all things, to the fullness of joy that is in His presence. We must dwell long, and expatiate upon the theme of free salvation, till men shall see and taste that the Lord is good; until they shall awake to the reality of His loving kindness; till they shall arise and put on the beautiful garments of Zion, and rejoice in the knowledge of His free grace; till their hearts shall be filled with gratitude, and their tongues tuned in thankful praise to the Author of all good.

Yes, this will lead men to love God, to trust in Him, and serve Him. This will lead them to worship Him truly and spiritually. It is only necessary that all men should come to a realizing sense of the unmeasured and ever active goodness of the Father of spirits; it is only necessary that they should know Him as He is, and they will love Him, and if they love Him, they will keep His commandments, and if they keep His commandments, they will be redeemed from sin, and made holy and happy.

T. B. T.

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER AND

PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

In presenting proposals for the third vol. of the Messenger it is merely necessary to say, that no essential change will be made in the course of the paper, unless it be to avail ourselves of every possible opportunity of increasing the talent and interest in its columns. It will, therefore, in the language it has ever held forth, to the world, continue to "plead the cause of a slandered and persecuted denomination of Christians—the UNIVERSALISTS;" endeavor to inspire confidence among its friends, and to induce as far as possible the thoughtless and unconcerned, and even opposers, to come forward into the field of examination and "reason together" on the great and glorious doctrines of a world's reconciliation to God.

Its motto may be, perhaps, the surest index to its character. It breathes neither wrath nor fury to the children of men, but on the contrary, it points to a peaceful messenger on the mountain top, proclaiming "good tidings" and publishing peace." "*How beautiful upon the mountains, are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace.*"

An interesting Discussion between Rev. E. S. Ely, (Presbyterian) and A. C. Thomas, one of the editors, is now in progress in its columns.

With unfeigned gratitude to the Universalist public for the many tokens of approbation bestowed upon our paper for the 2 years it has now been in existence, we submit these Proposals for the third volume, referring simply to the past, as a pledge for the future.

CONDITIONS.

The "N. Y. Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist," is published simultaneously in New-York and Philadelphia every Saturday morning, on a royal sheet, quarto form, and close print, at \$2 per annum, in advance, or \$2.50 if not paid within the first 6 months.

Subscribers in New-York and Philadelphia will be promptly served by carriers, and all possible care will be observed in the Mailing department, that subscribers may regularly receive their papers.

The publishing office in New-York is at No's. 2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham Square, and in Philadelphia, for the present, at No. 132 Chesnut-street adjoining the United States Bank.

P. PRICE, Publisher and Proprietor.

P. PRICE, PRINTER.

Nos. 2 and 3 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, where JOB PRINTING will be neatly executed, on reasonable terms. Orders solicited.